

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-16 remain pending in the application. By this Amendment claims 1, 7, 11 and 14 are amended.

In numbered paragraph 5, page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over the Examiner's cited Ecolore screen shots and source codes: glossaries.xml, glossaries\_en.xml, glossaries\_el.xml, glossaries.xml?lang=en, glossaries.xml?lang=el; source: July 2003 WaybackMachine printouts of Ecolore website "ecolore.leeds.ac.uk/xml/links/glossaries.xml"; in view of US 2003/0037076 (Bravery et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has disclosed a data display system including a client computer and a server connected through a network. An exemplary display can result from a data display system comprising: a first memory, provided at the server, storing a plurality of data definition files of a first type defining contents of data to be displayed on said client computer; a second memory, provided at the server, storing a data definition file of a second type defining, as data, file names of said data definition files of the first type; a third memory, provided at the server, storing a style definition file, defining a style for displaying said data definition file, and switching a file to be displayed among said plurality of data definition files of the first type by using said data definition file of the second type (e.g., paragraph [0010]). As exemplified in Fig. 9, a browser device of the client computer identifies the style definition file, checks contents of the data definition file of the second type and selects one of the data definition files of the first type and downloads the same to the client computer; and a

display displays data on the client computer using the files downloaded by the browser device from said first, second and third memories. As exemplified in Fig. 10, paragraph [0084] in Applicants' specification recites, "when the display language is changed from English to Japanese, the file that is newly downloaded is XML2 only. Thus, the amount of data to be transmitted can be reduced."

The applied references, considered individually or in combination, would not have taught or suggested at least, among other recited features, when the contents of data to be displayed are updated, the browser device newly downloads only one of the data definition files of the first type and updates the contents of data to be displayed, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 7, 11 and 14.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that "Ecolore illustrates a display displaying data on the client computer using the files stored in said first, second and third memories, since the data that is displayed to the client is the webpage of glossaries.xml?lang=en, which is glossaries.xml with the content of glossaries\_en.xml rendered by an XSLT." Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's ultimate conclusion. Even if the Ecolore xml rendering is somehow construed to map to Applicants' files from the first, second and third memories, the Ecolore citation would not have taught or suggested at least Applicants' claimed feature of "when the contents of data to be displayed are updated, the browser device newly downloads only one of the data definition files of the first type and updates the contents of data to be displayed," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 7, 11 and 14. The Examiner admits at page 6 that "Ecolore does not explicitly teach, word for word, server and browser device."

The Bravery et al. publication does not cure the deficiencies of the Ecolore citation. Rather, the relevant passage of the Bravery et al. publication, as relied upon by the Examiner, merely recites a method of generating a style sheet for applying presentation characteristics to Web page content, wherein referenced style sheet components include style sheet commands for applying presentation characteristics to dynamic data retrieved from a Web server. This in itself would not have inferred displaying data on a client computer using the files downloaded by the browser device from the first, second and third memories as Applicants have claimed. Further, the Bravery et al. publication, individually or in combination with the Ecolore citation, would not have taught or suggested at least Applicants' claimed feature of "when the contents of data to be displayed are updated, the browser device newly downloads only one of the data definition files of the first type and updates the contents of data to be displayed," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 7, 11 and 14.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant's claims 1, 7, 11 and 14 are allowable. The remaining dependent claims recite additional advantageous features which further distinguish over the documents relied upon by the Examiner. As such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: December 11, 2007

By:



Richard J. Kim  
Registration No. 48360

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620